



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,476	01/27/2004	Koji Shimizu	118245	9140
25944 7590 01/21/2009 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
AMADEZ, RODNEY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/21/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/764,476

Applicant(s)

SHIMIZU ET AL.

Examiner

RODNEY AMADIZ

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 11-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 11-16 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 13 and 16 state that all second wiring lines have the same length. Figure 4 teaches that the second wiring lines are U1-U3. It is evident from this figure that these wiring lines do not have the same length. Furthermore, page 3, paragraph 43 of the specification states the following: "In this exemplary embodiment, assuming that each of the lines from the first input terminals T1a, T2a, and T3a to the terminals Ti1, Ti2, and Ti3 is considered as a single wiring line, **these wiring lines** have the same length and width. Therefore, equivalent low-pass filters composed by these wiring lines have the same structure. Thus, the selection signals S1 to S3 supplied to any one of the demultiplexers have the same waveforms." (Emphasis Added). From this passage, it can be seen that the wiring lines extending from T1a, T2a, and T3a to the terminals Ti1, Ti2, and Ti3 have the same length and width, however, since the wiring lines U1-U3 are only a portion of the wiring lines extending from T1a, T2a, and T3a to the terminals Ti1, Ti2, and Ti3, it does not

teach that the wiring lines U1-U3 have the same length; therefore, there is inadequate support for the claimed limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al. (U.S. Patent 7,057,589—hereinafter “Shin”) in view of Nakano et al. (USPGPUB 2003/0063048—hereinafter “Nakano”) in view of Watanabe et al. (U.S. Patent 5,534,809—hereinafter “Watanabe”).

As to **Claim 9**, Shin teaches an electro-optical device comprising:
a substrate having one or more edges each at a peripheral portion of the substrate (***Fig. 4, 210***);
scanning lines (***Fig. 4, X1-XM***);
data lines (***D1-Dn and Y1-Y3n***);
pixels arranged over the substrate at positions that correspond to intersections between the scanning lines and the data lines, the pixels forming a matrix (***Fig. 4, 210 and 212***);
selection-signal input terminals arranged close together (***Fig. 5, at the far left, note the three nodes at the intersections of lines 241, 243 and 245 with the lines***

going into MR1, MG1 and MB1, respectively), each of the selection-signal input terminals being supplied with a selection signal (**Fig. 5, HR, HG and HB**);

image-signal input terminals supplied with image-signals (**Fig. 5, D1**),
a selecting circuit (**Fig. 4, 240**) selectively supplying image signals to the data lines on the basis of the selection signals (**See Fig. 5, wherein data signal D1 is supplied to Y1, Y2 and Y3 on the basis of the selection signals (241, 243 and 245) and Col. 7, lines 9-41**), and the selecting circuit including switching elements (**Fig. 5, MR1, MG1 and MB1**) having first input-output terminals connected to the data lines (**Fig. 5, note connection to Y1, Y2 and Y3**), a second input-output terminal connected to a node supplying the image signals (**Fig. 5, note connection to D1 through node**), and control input terminals to which the selection signals are supplied (**Fig. 5, note connections from 241, 243 and 245 to MR1, MG1 and MB1, respectively**);

a selection-signal supplying device to supply the selection signals to the selection-signal input terminals (**Fig. 5, note signals HR, HG and HB coming from controller (not shown)—Col. 7, lines 9-41**), and

selection-signals supplying lines that connect the selection-signal input terminals to the control input terminals; (**Fig. 5, note the signal lines that extend downward and then left from lines 241, 243 and 245**);

the control input terminals of the selection circuits being arranged in the same direction as that of the selection-signal input terminals and in the same order as the corresponding selection-signal input terminals (**See Fig. 5**).

Shin fails to teach the arrangement wherein the selection-signal input terminals and the image-signal input terminals are aligned along a corresponding edge of the substrate and located between the matrix and the corresponding edge. Examiner cites Nakano to teach that the selection-signal input terminals and the image-signal input terminals are aligned along a corresponding edge of the substrate and located between the matrix and the corresponding edge (**See Fig. 1 and the location of the selection-signal input from element 5 and the image-signals input from D1-DN/2**). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Nakano (that is, placing the input terminals of the selection-signals and the image-signals along a corresponding edge and between the matrix) in the electro-optical device taught by Shin in order to keep all connections to one end, thereby making cleaner connections.

Shin, as modified by Nakano, fails to teach all of the signal-supplying lines having the same length from the corresponding selective-signal input terminal to the control input terminal of the corresponding switching element to compose an equivalent low-pass filter. Examiner cites Watanabe to teach that the concept of having wiring lines of the same length is well known (**Col. 6, lines 45-48**). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Watanabe (i.e. make wiring lines with the same length) in the electro-optical device taught by Shin as modified by Nakano so that each signal-supplying line, from the selective-signal input terminal to the control input terminal, may be equal in

load capacitance (**Col. 6, lines 45-48**). The resulting combination of Shin, Nakano and Watanabe yields an equivalent low-pass filter.

As to **Claim 11**, Shin, teaches an electronic apparatus comprising the electro-optical device of Claim 9 (**Shin—See Fig. 4**).

As to **Claim 12**, Shin teaches that each of the selection-signal supplying lines includes a first wiring line extending from the selection-signal input terminal in a same direction as the direction in which the data lines extend, and extends in a direction intersecting the direction in which the data lines extend (**Fig. 5, (left side) note the intersection of lines 241, 243 and 245 with the first wiring lines that extend downwards in the direction of the data lines and then to the right (in a direction intersecting the direction of the data lines) towards MR1, MG1 and MB1, respectively**).

Shin fails to teach a second wiring line extending from the first wiring line to the control input terminal in a same direction as the direction in which the data lines extend. However, the specification shows no apparent benefits from having a second wiring line extend from the first wiring line to the control input in a same direction as the direction in which the data lines extend. Therefore, having a second wiring line extend in specific directions is clearly a design choice based on the specific requirement of the claim. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add a second wiring line to the electro-optical device taught by Shin and extend it in any direction since extending the wiring lines in any direction would perform equally well at carrying and providing the intended signal.

As to **Claim 13**, Shin, as modified by Nakano, fails to teach that all second wiring lines, that extend from a respective control input terminals to a same first wiring line, have the same length. Examiner cites Watanabe to teach that the concept of having wiring lines of the same length is well known (**Col. 6, lines 45-48**). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Watanabe (i.e. make wiring lines with the same length) in the electro-optical device taught by Shin as modified by Nakano so that each second wiring line, may be equal in load capacitance (**Col. 6, lines 45-48**). The resulting combination of Shin, Nakano and Watanabe yields an equivalent low-pass filter.

5. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin, Nakano and Watanabe as applied to claims 9 and 11-13 above, and further in view of Haga et al. (USPGPUB 2003/0067434—hereinafter "Haga").

As to **Claim 14**, Shin, as modified by Nakano and Watanabe, fails to teach secondary selection-signal input terminals arranged close together, the secondary selection-signal terminals being located between the matrix and the corresponding edge of the substrate and being aligned with the selection-signal input terminals and the image-signal input terminals along the corresponding edge, each first wiring line, that extends from a respective selection-signal input terminal, extending to a respective secondary selection-signal input terminal. Examiner cites Haga to teach a second input terminal provided as the second end of the signal-supplying lines, wherein each first wiring line that extends from a respective selection-signal input terminal, extends to a

respective secondary selection-signal input terminal. (**Fig. 20, Reference Number 107 and note that 108 is being fed to both ends of 107—See also Pg. 5, ¶ 80, Pg. 7, ¶ 117 and Pg. 13, ¶ 218**). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a second input terminal to the signal supplying line as taught by Haga in the electro-optical device taught by Shin, as modified by Nakano and Watanabe, in order to reduce signal delay on the wiring lines. Furthermore, the combination of Shin and Nakano already teaches that the selection-signal terminals are located between the matrix and the corresponding edge of the substrate and Haga teaches that the secondary input terminals are aligned with the first selection-signal input terminals; therefore, the combination of Shin, Nakano, Watanabe and Haga meet the claim limitations.

As to **Claim 15**, Shin teaches that each of the selection-signal supplying lines includes a first wiring line extending from the selection-signal input terminal in a same direction as the direction in which the data lines extend, and extends in a direction intersecting the direction in which the data lines extend (**Fig. 5, (left side) note the intersection of lines 241, 243 and 245 with the first wiring lines that extend downwards in the direction of the data lines and then to the right (in a direction intersecting the direction of the data lines) towards MR1, MG1 and MB1, respectively**).

Shin fails to teach a second wiring line extending from the first wiring line to the control input terminal in a same direction as the direction in which the data lines extend. However, the specification shows no apparent benefits from having a second wiring line

extend from the first wiring line to the control input in a same direction as the direction in which the data lines extend. Therefore, having a second wiring line extend in specific directions is clearly a design choice based on the specific requirement of the claim. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add a second wiring line to the electro-optical device taught by Shin and extend it in any direction since extending the wiring lines in any direction would perform equally well at carrying and providing the intended signal.

As to **Claim 16**, Shin, as modified by Nakano and Haga, fails to teach that all second wiring lines, that extend from a respective control input terminals to a same first wiring line, have the same length. Examiner cites Watanabe to teach that the concept of having wiring lines of the same length is well known (**Col. 6, lines 45-48**). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Watanabe (i.e. make wiring lines with the same length) in the electro-optical device taught by Shin, as modified by Nakano and Haga, so that each second wiring line, may be equal in load capacitance (**Col. 6, lines 45-48**). The resulting combination of Shin, Nakano, Haga and Watanabe yields an equivalent low-pass filter.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9 and 11-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RODNEY AMADIZ whose telephone number is (571)272-7762. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (571) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sumati Lefkowitz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/R. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2629
1/13/09